

**To:** Garvin, Shawn[garvin.shawn@epa.gov]  
**From:** Bloomgren, David  
**Sent:** Wed 1/22/2014 8:49:47 PM  
**Subject:** FW: QUESTION Re: URGENT: Al Jazeera America Inquiry

For quick discussion when policy mtg ends.

**From:** Behringer, Caroline  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 22, 2014 3:49 PM  
**To:** Jones, Enesta  
**Cc:** Bloomgren, David; Hull, George  
**Subject:** Fw: QUESTION Re: URGENT: Al Jazeera America Inquiry

Enesta - I'm away from my computer - do we have an earlier statement that makes clear EPA's role here?  
We won't be commenting on ATSDR's role.

Thanks  
CB

Caroline Behringer  
Deputy Press Secretary  
Office of the Administrator  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
Office: (202) 564-0098  
Cell: (202) 760-1732

---

**From:** Kim Hutcherson <[Kim.Hutcherson@aljazeera.net](mailto:Kim.Hutcherson@aljazeera.net)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 22, 2014 3:45:08 PM  
**To:** Behringer, Caroline; David Douglas  
**Subject:** RE: QUESTION Re: URGENT: Al Jazeera America Inquiry

we will do that -- we are just trying to understand the difference between testing the water system and testing water samples. if it is a simple difference in verbiage, that's fine. we just want to be clear.

but this does lead to another question -- the fact that this info comes directly from the ATSDR/CDC mean that they are taking the lead in Charleston re testing? how the water is being tested seems like a fairly significant matter -- is the EPA in more of an advisory role here?

thanks for all your help~

Kim Hutcherson  
SE Region Bureau Producer  
Nashville, Tennessee

Al Jazeera America  
(404) 983-0630

(615) 418-6181

---

**From:** Behringer, Caroline [Behringer.Caroline@epa.gov]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 22, 2014 3:31 PM  
**To:** David Douglas; Kim Hutcherson  
**Cc:** Jonathan Martin; Robert Ray; Sarah Jones; Marcy McGinnis; Justin Dial; Jacob Ward  
**Subject:** RE: QUESTION Re: URGENT: Al Jazeera America Inquiry

Hey David,

That portion of our statement is information pulled directly from a statement from ATSDR, who we are coordinated with. Please reach out to them directly about this statement and any discrepancies.

Thanks,

Caroline

Caroline Behringer

Deputy Press Secretary

Office of the Administrator

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Office: (202) 564-0098

Cell: (202) 760-1732

**From:** David Douglas [mailto:David.Douglas@aljazeera.net]

**Sent:** Wednesday, January 22, 2014 3:23 PM  
**To:** Behringer, Caroline; Kim Hutcherson  
**Cc:** Jonathan Martin; Robert Ray; Sarah Jones; Marcy McGinnis; Justin Dial; Jacob Ward  
**Subject:** QUESTION Re: URGENT: Al Jazeera America Inquiry

Hi Caroline,

One urgent question:

Below find quoted text in a statement provided to Al Jazeera America from the water company, West Virginia American Water. This appears to contradict in part a portion of your statement quoted below. There could be a difference between 'samples' and the 'water system'. Can you explain the difference or what may be a discrepancy between agencies?

**Portion of your statement:**

The Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) provided the following information regarding the newly identified chemical: Toxicologic information on PPH is limited. Based on the Material Safety Data Sheets (MSDS) provided by the manufacturer, the reported toxicity of this material appears to be lower than the toxicity of MCHM (LD50 > 2000 mg/kg for the primary component of PPH vs. 825 mg/kg for MCHM). Given the small percentage of PPH in the tank and information suggesting similar water solubility as MCHM, it is likely that any amount of PPH currently in the water system would be extremely low. However, the water system has not been tested for this material.

**Portion of Water Company Statement:**

West Virginia American Water has multiple laboratories, including MATRIC (Mid-Atlantic Technology, Research & Innovation Center) in South Charleston, testing water samples and analyzing data, and we will share those results when available. The water samples being tested are samples collected both before and after the “Do Not Use” order was lifted. Customers do not need to flush or take any additional action at this time. The interagency team will communicate with our customers the water sample

results we obtain from this new round of testing.

Thank you,

David



**DAVID DOUGLAS**

**Field Producer**

AL JAZEERA AMERICA

M +1 312 273 3001

---

aljazeera.com | t: @daviddouglastv

**From:** <Behringer>, Caroline <[Behringer.Caroline@epa.gov](mailto:Behringer.Caroline@epa.gov)>

**Date:** Wednesday, January 22, 2014 1:34 PM

**To:** Kim Hutcherson <[Kim.Hutcherson@aljazeera.net](mailto:Kim.Hutcherson@aljazeera.net)>, David Douglas <[David.Douglas@aljazeera.net](mailto:David.Douglas@aljazeera.net)>

**Cc:** Jonathan Martin <[Jonathan.Martin@aljazeera.net](mailto:Jonathan.Martin@aljazeera.net)>, Robert Ray <[Robert.Ray@aljazeera.net](mailto:Robert.Ray@aljazeera.net)>

**Subject:** RE: URGENT: Al Jazeera America Inquiry

Hi Kim et al,

Here's a statement from EPA in response to your questions:

Early January 21, during an operations meeting at the facility, Freedom Chemical informed the State of

West Virginia, the West Virginia American Water Company, and EPA that another chemical was part of the release that occurred on January 9, 2014. This chemical has been identified as a proprietary mixture of polyglycol ethers (PPH). It was in the same tank and entered the water system at the same time as the MCHM. PPH represented a relatively small percentage (approximately 5%) of the total volume in the tank. EPA shared this information with the Chemical Safety Board and the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR).

The Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) provided the following information regarding the newly identified chemical: Toxicologic information on PPH is limited. Based on the Material Safety Data Sheets (MSDS) provided by the manufacturer, the reported toxicity of this material appears to be lower than the toxicity of MCHM (LD50 > 2000 mg/kg for the primary component of PPH vs. 825 mg/kg for MCHM). Given the small percentage of PPH in the tank and information suggesting similar water solubility as MCHM, it is likely that any amount of PPH currently in the water system would be extremely low. However, the water system has not been tested for this material.

EPA will continue to support work with the State, the WVAMC and its federal partners to address this new development and continues to be available for sampling and monitoring assistance.

Please let me know if you need anything else,

Caroline

Caroline Behringer

Deputy Press Secretary

Office of the Administrator

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Office: (202) 564-0098

Cell: (202) 760-1732

**From:** Kim Hutcherson [<mailto:Kim.Hutcherson@aljazeera.net>]

**Sent:** Wednesday, January 22, 2014 1:11 PM

**To:** David Douglas; Behringer, Caroline

**Cc:** Jonathan Martin; Robert Ray

**Subject:** RE: URGENT: Al Jazeera America Inquiry

hi there~

I know our correspondent, Jonathan Martin, will likely have some questions for you as well, but here are some of the major questions for which we would like answers:

can the EPA definitively say how much MCHM leached into the river and soil? is there any indication that contamination is ongoing?

when did the EPA find out about the second chemical, PPH? what were these two chemicals doing in the same tank?

how is the EPA testing for water contamination? why haven't the testing protocols been released, as is standard procedure in most environmental disasters?

have the private companies involved conformed to the law in their reporting of this accident?

what is the EPA's plan for Charleston going forward?

please feel free to reach out to me if you have any questions!

Kim Hutcherson  
SE Region Bureau Producer  
Nashville, Tennessee

Al Jazeera America  
(404) 983-0630

(615) 418-6181

---

**From:** David Douglas  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 22, 2014 12:49 PM  
**To:** Behringer, Caroline; Kim Hutcherson  
**Subject:** Re: URGENT: Al Jazeera America Inquiry

Hi Caroline,

Our correspondent Jonathan Martin is next on the air at 4pm. I've looped in my producing colleague Kim Hutcherson.

Thank you,

David

David Douglas

Field Producer

Al Jazeera America

Chicago Bureau

312.273.3001

[aljazeera.com](http://aljazeera.com)

On Jan 22, 2014, at 11:54, "Behringer, Caroline" <[Behringer.Caroline@epa.gov](mailto:Behringer.Caroline@epa.gov)> wrote:

David – Would it be possible to get your specific questions and deadline?

Thanks,

Caroline

Caroline Behringer

Deputy Press Secretary

Office of the Administrator

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Office: (202) 564-0098

Cell: (202) 760-1732

**From:** David Douglas [<mailto:David.Douglas@aljazeera.net>]

**Sent:** Wednesday, January 22, 2014 11:45 AM

**To:** Behringer, Caroline

**Subject:** Fwd: URGENT: Al Jazeera America Inquiry

Thank you for your help.

David Douglas

Field Producer

Al Jazeera America

Chicago Bureau

312.273.3001

[aljazeera.com](http://aljazeera.com)

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** <[David.Douglas@aljazeera.net](mailto:David.Douglas@aljazeera.net)>

**Date:** January 22, 2014 at 11:42:07 EST

**To:** "<[press@epa.gov](mailto:press@epa.gov)>" <[press@epa.gov](mailto:press@epa.gov)>

**Subject:** URGENT: Al Jazeera America Inquiry

Hi Folks,

Curious to get in touch to see how the EPA is involved in the contaminated water situation in West Virginia today, in light of the discovery of a second chemical in the tank that leaked into the Elk River.

Can you please get in touch?

Thanks,



David

David Douglas  
Field Producer  
Al Jazeera America  
Chicago Bureau  
312.273.3001  
[aljazeera.com](http://aljazeera.com)

---

Notice: This email is intended only for the use of the individual or entity named above and may contain information that is confidential and privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this email is strictly prohibited. Opinions, conclusions and other information in this message that do not relate to the official business of our firm shall be understood as neither given nor endorsed by it.